arXiv:hep-ph/9305227v1 7 May 1993

CERN-TH.6882/93

Thermal quark production in pure glue and quark gluon plasmas

Tanguy Altherr* and David Seibert†

Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Abstract

We calculate production rates for massless (u, d) and massive (s, c, b) quarks in pure glue and quark gluon plasmas to leading order in the strong coupling constant g. The leading contribution comes from gluon decay into $q\bar{q}$ pairs, using a thermal gluon propagator with finite thermal mass and damping rate. The rate behaves as $\alpha_S^2(\ln 1/\alpha_S)^2 T^4$ when $m, \alpha_S \to 0$ and depends linearly on the transverse gluon damping rate for all values of the quark mass m. The light quark (u, d, s) chemical equilibration time is approximately 10-100 T^{-1} for g =2-3, so that quarks are likely to remain far from chemical equilibrium in ultrarelativistic nuclear collisions.

Submitted to Physics Letters B

CERN-TH.6882/93
April 1993

*On leave of absence from L.A.P.P., BP110, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France. Internet: taltherr@vxcern.cern.ch.

†On leave until October 12, 1993 from: Physics Department, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242 USA. Internet: seibert@surya11.cern.ch.

Ultrarelativistic nuclear collisions may present a unique opportunity to study the high temperature behaviour of hadronic matter in the laboratory. It is possible that in these experiments, the produced energy densities might be high enough and last for long enough for bulk, locally equilibrated, deconfined matter, or quark gluon plasma (QGP), to be created and studied. However, recent work [1,2] has shown that, while the hot matter should thermalize in about 0.3 fm/c, it may be largely a gluon plasma (GP), with few quarks. Chemical equilibration is expected to take much longer than thermal equilibration, if it occurs at all.

One of the proposed signals for QGP is copious production of strange particles [3], as the strangeness production rate is much higher in QGP than in normal hadronic matter. Similarly, it has also been argued that thermal charm production in a QGP could be large [4]. However, these rates have never been calculated using thermal field theory.

In this paper, we calculate the thermal quark production rate to leading order in α_S for GP and for QGP. This gives the chemical equilibration rates for both the massless (u, d) and massive (s, c, b) quark components of QGP. We find that these rates are small; the light quarks (u, d, s) chemical equilibration time is approximately 10-100 T^{-1} for g =2-3, so that quarks are likely to remain far from chemical equilibrium in ultrarelativistic nuclear collisions.

We take the idealized situation of a GP or QGP in thermal equilibrium. If such a plasma does exist, the massless gluons evolve into quasi-particles with effective masses of order gT [5]. Being massive, these quasi-gluons decay into $q\bar{q}$ pairs. This situation is similar to the plasmon decay into $\nu\bar{\nu}$ pairs that is the dominant cooling mechanism for high density stars [6].

For gauge field theories at high temperature, there exists a resummation program developed by Braaten and Pisarski [7] that describes these quasi-particles. It is easy to check that this resummation program is almost the same for the cases of QGP and GP. The difference is that the quark contribution inside each hard thermal loop is omitted in the case of a GP, because there are no thermal quarks. For instance, the plasma frequency is

$$\omega_0^2 = \left(N + \frac{N_f}{2}\right) \frac{g^2 T^2}{9}, \tag{1}$$

for $SU(N)$ gauge theory at temperature T, where g is the strong coupling constant and N_f is the number of massless fermion flavours. Thermal effects in QGP and GP are thus identical, except that $N_f = 0$ for GP.

The discussion of the different QCD corrections to the production of $q\bar{q}$ pairs is best illustrated by using "cut" diagrams [8,9]. The lowest order diagram is shown in Fig. 1. To disentangle the contributions from different graphs and from different discontinuities within the same graph, we consider only the leading term in the strong coupling constant g as $g \to 0$.

Following the usual treatment of Braaten and Pisarski [7] in such a situation, we consider the two cases when the gluon momentum is soft, $Q \sim gT$, and hard, $Q \sim T$. If it is soft, one has to use the effective quark-gluon vertices and gluon propagators which resum the hard thermal loops [7]. One is therefore left with a quite involved calculation as several discontinuities can be taken in such a case. In principle, this situation should be

very similar to previous calculations such as photon emission from a QGP [10]. Indeed, the naïve lowest order diagrams for the $q\bar{q}$ production are the two-gluon fusion processes shown in Fig. 2. However, it is well known that these diagrams have a logarithmic singularity when the quark mass, m, goes to zero [11]. The cross section for this process is

$$\sigma_{gg\to q\bar{q}} = \frac{\pi\alpha_S^2}{3s}\ln\frac{s}{m^2} \qquad \text{when} \quad s \gg m^2. \tag{2}$$

The divergence being of kinematic origin, it is clear that in the case of unthermalized and zero mass quarks, this singularity can be screened only by the thermal gluon mass, of order gT. As typical gluon energies are of order T, the quark production rate must then behave as $g^4T^4\ln 1/g$. When the unthermalized outgoing quarks are massive, the cross section for the processes in Fig. 2 is no longer singular and leads to a contribution of $\mathcal{O}(g^4T^4)$ to the production rate.

A consistent calculation would require a division of the processes into two pieces by the introduction of an intermediate cutoff $gT \ll q^* \ll T$ on the gluon line (as in the photon emission case). Then the hard part, calculated from the first two graphs shown in Fig. 2, gives a contribution of order $g^4T^4\ln(T/q^*)$. On the other hand, the soft part, calculated from the discontinuity of the graph in Fig. 1 together with effective vertices and gluon propagator, must give $g^4T^4\ln(q^*/\omega_0)$ with the same coefficient in front so that, by adding the two contributions, the q^* dependence cancels. To be honest, we have not checked that the coefficient in front of the logarithm is the same for the soft and the hard pieces but we do not see any reason why it should differ.

If the gluon momentum is hard and if one is using a bare gluon propagator, the rate vanishes for obvious kinematic reasons. However, as in the $\gamma \to \nu\bar{\nu}$ process, one could also use a resummed propagator for the hard gluon, leading to a finite answer (in fact a contribution of order g^4T^4 as we shall see). But unlike the photon, the gluon has an anomalously large damping rate and if the hard thermal gluon mass starts to be relevant, one must also include the damping rate inside the hard gluon propagator. We show that the rate behaves then as $g^4T^4(\ln 1/g)^2$ for massless quarks and as $g^4T^4\ln 1/g$ for massive quarks. It is therefore *larger* than the soft gluon contribution and than the naïve lowest order diagrams shown in Fig. 2. The precise reasons for this unusual behaviour will become clear as the calculation proceeds.

The gluon propagator that we use is therefore

$$\frac{-i\mathcal{P}^{\mu\nu}_{T(L)}\delta_{ab}}{Q^2 - \mathrm{Re}\Pi_{T(L)}(\omega,q) + 2iq^0\gamma_{T(L)}}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{P}^{\mu\nu}_{T(L)}$ is the transverse (longitudinal) projector [5] and a and b are colour indices. Here (and for the rest of this paper) the subscript $T(L)$ refers to transversely (longitudinally) polarized gluons. We have included the thermal gluon mass at hard momentum, $\mathrm{Re}\Pi_{T(L)}(\omega,q)$, and also the anomalously large gluon damping rate, $\gamma_{T(L)}$ [12].

Using the cutting rules of Kobes and Semenoff [9], the quark (antiquark) production rate due to transverse gluon decay is given by

$$R_T^{\mathrm{q}} = \frac{dN_T^{\mathrm{q}}}{d^4x} = g^2\int\frac{d^4Q}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^4K}{(2\pi)^4}\,(2\pi)^2\,\delta[K^2-m^2]\,\delta[(Q-K)^2-m^2](n_B(\omega)+\theta(-q^0))$$

$$\times \mathrm{Re}\frac{2i}{Q^2 - \mathrm{Re}\Pi_T(Q) + 2iq^0\gamma_T}\,(T^a_{bc})^2\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\not{K}+m)\gamma_\mu(\not{K}-\not{Q}+m)\gamma_\nu\right]\,\mathcal{P}_T^{\mu\nu}. \quad (4)$$

Here K and Q are the quark and gluon four-momenta respectively, m is the quark mass, and n_B is the Bose-Einstein distribution function. The transverse gluon projection operator is $\mathcal{P}_T^{ij} = -\delta^{ij} + q^i q^j/q^2$, with all other components zero, and T^a_{bc} are the colour $SU(3)$ matrices. We use the standard high energy conventions that $\hbar = c = k_B = 1$.

The integrals over q^0 and $\cos\theta = \hat{k}\cdot\hat{q}$ can be evaluated by using the two δ-functions, while the remaining angular integrals are all trivial:

$$R_T^{\mathrm{q}} = \frac{g^2}{6\pi^4}\int_{2m}^{\infty} d\omega\, n_B(\omega)\int_0^{\sqrt{\omega^2-4m^2}} dq\, q\,\frac{\omega\gamma_T}{\left[\omega^2 - q^2 - \mathrm{Re}\Pi_T(Q)\right]^2 + 4\omega^2\gamma_T^2} \times \int dE\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\not{K}+m)\gamma_\mu(\not{K}-\not{Q}+m)\gamma_\nu\right]\,\mathcal{P}_T^{\mu\nu}. \quad (5)$$

The trace over colour indices gives a factor 4/3, the quark energy $k^0 = E = (k^2+m^2)^{1/2}$, and the gluon energy $q^0 = \omega$. The transverse component of the trace is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\not{K}+m)\gamma_\mu(\not{K}-\not{Q}+m)\gamma_\nu\right]\,\mathcal{P}_T^{\mu\nu} &= 4\left[2K_\mu K_\nu - K_\mu Q_\nu - Q_\mu K_\nu + K\cdot Q g_{\mu\nu}\right]\,\mathcal{P}_T^{\mu\nu} \\ &= 4\left[\omega^2 - q^2 - 2k^2(1-\cos^2\theta)\right], \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\cos\theta \;=\; (2\omega E - \omega^2 + q^2)/(2kq). \quad (7)$$

We then integrate the trace over the allowed range of E, where $|\omega^2 - q^2 - 2E\omega| \le 2kq$:

$$R_T^{\mathrm{q}} = \frac{4g^2}{9\pi^4}\int_{2m}^{\infty} d\omega\;\omega n_B(\omega)\int_0^{\sqrt{\omega^2-4m^2}} dq\;q^2\frac{\gamma_T\left(\omega^2 - q^2 + 2m^2\right)\left[1-\frac{4m^2}{\omega^2-q^2}\right]^{1/2}}{\left[\omega^2 - q^2 - \mathrm{Re}\Pi_T(Q)\right]^2 + 4\omega^2\gamma_T^2}. \quad (8)$$

The integral in eq. (8) is cut off by n_B when $\omega/T \gg 1$. The crucial point of our analysis is that the leading contribution comes when ω and q are hard, of order T. The soft Q contribution is perfectly regular and subleading by $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S)$. Because the dominant gluon momenta are hard, we make the subsequent approximations: i) γ_T is independent of the momentum and is given by [12]

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_T &= \frac{g^2 NT}{8\pi}\left(\ln\frac{\omega_0^2}{m_{mag}^2 + 2m_{mag}\gamma_T} + 1.09681\ldots\right) \qquad \text{when } m_{mag} \gg \gamma_T, \\ &= \frac{\alpha_S NT}{2}\ln\frac{1}{\alpha_S} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_S T); \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

ii) as we are only interested in the leading order, we take $\mathrm{Re}\Pi_T = 3\omega_0^2/2$, as changing the δ-function $\delta(Q^2 - \mathrm{Re}\Pi_T)$ by a Lorentzian with width γ_T changes $\mathrm{Re}\Pi_T = 3\omega_0^2/2$ only by $\mathcal{O}(g^4T^2)$ corrections. The gluon damping rate depends on the magnetic mass which is, for dimensional reasons, a number times g^2T [13]. Fortunately, this uncertainty enters only at the logarithmic level.

When $m = 0$, we evaluate the integral over q analytically, obtaining a simple result:

$$R_T^{\rm q} = \frac{2g^2\gamma_T}{9\pi^4}\int_0^\infty d\omega\,\omega^2\,n_B(\omega)\left\{\ln\frac{64\omega^4}{9\omega_0^4+16\gamma_T^2\omega^2}+\frac{3\omega_0^2}{2\gamma_T\omega}\left(\arctan\frac{3\omega_0^2}{4\gamma_T\omega}+\arctan\frac{2\omega}{\gamma_T}\right)-4\right\}, \tag{10}$$

where terms of order higher than g^4 have been dropped. Notice that the limit $\gamma_T \to 0$ reproduces the result using a gluon propagator without a finite damping rate.

The final result is

$$R_T^{\rm q} = \frac{4\zeta(3)}{3\pi^3}\alpha_S^2\left(\ln\frac{1}{\alpha_S}\right)^2 T^4 + \mathcal{O}\left(\alpha_S^2\ln\frac{1}{\alpha_S}T^4\right). \tag{11}$$

It is in fact the Q^2 dependence of the rate that makes it so large. Should we use a bare gluon propagator, $\delta(Q^2)$, the rate would identically vanish. With just the hard thermal mass, $\delta(Q^2 - 3\omega_0^2/2)$, the rate is of order g^4T^4 with no logarithmic dependence. Taking into account the anomalously large damping rate γ_T shifts the gluon on-shellness $Q^2 \sim \omega_0^2$ by a logarithmic correction. The additional logarithm has a kinematic origin.

The processes that lead to our result are of the kind shown in Fig. 3. The enhancement comes both from the soft space-like gluon exchange (a Landau-damping term) and from the pole of the gluon propagator that is almost on shell, hence the two logarithms. This diagram is not suppressed kinematically. Notice also that using a resummed propagator for a hard line is not a new feature. For the calculation of the damping rate itself, one needs to use the same propagator [12,14].

It is easy to see that the longitudinal decay is subleading. The only difference (aside from the self-energies) between the longitudinal and transverse modes is a factor of two, as there are two transverse modes and only one longitudinal mode. At hard momentum, the longitudinal thermal mass is exponentially suppressed, $\mathrm{Re}\Pi_L = 0$, so we have in the case of zero bare quark mass

$$R_L^{\rm q} = \frac{g^2\gamma_L}{9\pi^4}\int_0^\infty d\omega\,\omega^2\,n_B(\omega)\left\{\ln\frac{2\omega}{\gamma_L}-4\right\}. \tag{12}$$

However, the longitudinal gluon damping rate is of order g^2T with no log. The quark production due to longitudinal gluon decay is therefore of the same order as the neglected terms in eq. (11).

The discussion for massive quarks is the same through eq. (8). When $m \gg \omega_0$, the rate behaves perturbatively as $g^2\gamma_T \propto g^4 \ln 1/g$, and is therefore larger than other contributions. We show in Fig. 4 the production rate as a function of m/T for GP ($N_f = 0$); the curves are very slightly altered for $N_f = 2$.

We stress again that our result is the leading order perturbatively (when $g \to 0$), containing all relevant contributions to order $\alpha_S^2(\ln 1/\alpha_S)^2$. The fact that the quark gluon plasma is not really a system of weak coupling is a different problem, and should in principle be solved by adding higher order contributions to our result. One should work in this perturbative picture to make a reliable prediction.

In any case, there seems to be a huge uncertainty in the quark production rate when considering large values of g ($g > 1$). As the rate is linearly dependent on the damping

rate, which itself depends on the value of the magnetic mass, which is unknown, it is difficult at present to evaluate the effect of higher order terms that are important for large g. We believe that the rate can easily vary by an order of magnitude. One should bear this in mind when making predictions for ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions. The disadvantage of this uncertainty can be turned into a gain, if one is able to measure the thermal charm or bottom quark production. This would give a direct measurement of the gluon damping rate, and hence of the magnetic mass.

Having computed the quark production rate, we also discuss the quark equilibration time given by $\tau_{\rm q} = N_{eq}/R_T^{\rm q}$, where N_{eq} is the quark density at equilibrium. In Fig. 5 we plot $\tau_{\rm q}$ as a function of m/T. In calculating N_{eq}, we take into account the complete mass (bare plus thermal corrections) at hard momentum,

$$\begin{aligned} m_\beta^2 &= m^2 + \frac{g^2T^2}{3} \qquad \text{when} \quad m \ll T, \\ m_\beta^2 &= m^2 + \frac{2g^2T^2}{9} \qquad \text{when} \quad m \gg T. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We cannot rigorously calculate the thermal mass between these limits, so we use the ansatz

$$m_\beta^2 = m^2 + \frac{(2+e^{-m/T})g^2T^2}{9}. \tag{14}$$

For vanishing quark mass, we obtain

$$\tau_{\rm q} = \frac{27\pi}{16\alpha_S^2(\ln 1/\alpha_S)^2}T^{-1}. \tag{15}$$

For comparison, we also give the gluon equilibration time. By detailed balance, the thermal gluon formation rate must be equal to the decay rate (twice the damping rate), so that

$$\tau_{\rm g} = \frac{1}{3\alpha_S \ln 1/\alpha_S}T^{-1}. \tag{16}$$

We see that gluons equilibrate faster than even the lightest quarks. This stems from the fact that quarks are always produced by pairs, which is a relatively slow process, while gluons can be copiously emitted by radiative processes.

Again, our results strongly depend on the value of the coupling constant. From the numbers that we obtain, it seems clear that, in ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions, only the light quarks (u, d, and s) may have time to come to chemical equilibrium, while the heavy quarks will not. Even taking $g = 3$, $\tau_{\rm q} > 10\,T^{-1}$ for massless quarks, so chemical equilibration will proceed very slowly.

In conclusion, we have calculated the quark production rate from pure glue and quark-gluon plasma in equilibrium. The leading contribution comes from the decay of transverse gluons, which are mainly characterized by an anomalously large damping rate γ_T. The analogy of this process with the plasmon decay into $\nu\bar{\nu}$ is very close but misleading. In the latter case, the photon damping rate is smaller, $\gamma_\gamma = \mathcal{O}(e^3 T \ln(1/e))$, so the plasmon is really described by a quasi-particle with an effective thermal mass. In a QCD plasma, this is clearly not the case, and one must be very careful in computing

the thermal rates by incorporating the damping rate inside the gluon propagator. Our result is another example of a physical quantity that is sensitive to the non-perturbative magnetic mass scale [12].

Although our calculation is perturbatively correct, there are large uncertainties when making predictions for ultra-relativistic heavy ion collisions for the following reasons: i) the rate is linearly dependent on γ_T, which depends on the unknown magnetic mass, and ii) the quark gluon plasma, which could be formed in such collisions is not really a system of weak coupling, so higher order terms should be calculated.

This material is based upon work supported by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization under a grant awarded in 1991.

References

1. K. Geiger, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 4965.
2. E. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 3270.
3. J. Rafelski and B. Müller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1066.
4. A. Shor, Phys. Lett. **B215** (1988) 375.
5. V. V. Klimov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **33** (1981) 934; H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1394; O. Kalashnikov, Fortschr. Phys. **32** (1984) 525; R. D. Pisarski, Physica **A158** (1989) 146.
6. E. Braaten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1655.
7. E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. **B337** (1990) 569 and **B339** (1990) 310.
8. H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2007.
9. R. L. Kobes and G. W. Semenoff, Nucl. Phys. **B260** (1985) 714 and **B272** (1986) 329; N. Ashida, H. Nakkagawa, A. Niégawa and H. Yokota, Ann. Phys. (NY) **215** (1992) 315.
10. J. Kapusta, P. Lichard and D. Seibert, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 2744; R. Baier, H. Nakkagawa, A. Niégawa and K. Redlich, Z. Phys. **C53** (1992) 433.
11. B. L. Combridge, Nucl. Phys. **B151** (1979) 429.
12. R. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 1129; R. Pisarski, BNL preprint BNL-P-1/92.
13. D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski and L. G. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 43.
14. V. V. Lebedev and A. V. Smilga, Ann. Phys. **202** (1990) 229; T. Altherr, E. Petitgirard and T. del Rio Gaztelurrutia, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 703.

Figure captions

1. The lowest-order "cut" diagram for thermal quark production.
2. The naïve lowest order Feynman diagrams for quark-antiquark production.
3. A Feynman diagram contributing to leading order for thermal quark production.
4. The quark production rate, $R_T^{\rm q}$, in a GP ($N_f = 0$) as a function of m/T.
5. The quark chemical equilibration time, $\tau_{\rm q}$, in a GP as a function of m/T.